

Serial Number: 09/855,272

Docket Number: 10010535-1

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12-17, 19-22, and 25-27 have been amended herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-27 have been rejected under 25 U.S.C. §103a as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6, 163,779 issued to Mantha et al. (hereafter "Mantha") in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication U.S. 2003/0115546 A1 filed by Dubey et al. (hereinafter "Dubey"). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP §2143.03, In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant asserts that the cited combination of Mantha and Dubey fails to show or suggest each of the elements of the amended claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-27 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite as follows:

1. A method for writing a hypermedia file to a multimedia storage device, comprising:
depicting a content of the hypermedia file in a graphical user interface using an application in a computer system;
associating a write actuator with the content of the hypermedia file depicted in the graphical user interface;
determining if any of the content of the hypermedia file is restricted from being stored in the multimedia storage device upon manipulation of the write actuator;
packaging at least a non-restricted portion of the hypermedia file for storage in the multimedia storage device; and
writing the at least the non-restricted portion of hypermedia file to the multimedia storage device.

As set forth above, claim 1 has been amended so as to include the subject matter of "determining if any of the content of the hypermedia files restricted from being stored in the multimedia storage device upon manipulation of the write actuator." Applicant asserts that this element is neither shown nor suggested by the cited combination of Mantha and Dubey.

In addition, claim 1 as amended indicated that at least a non-restricted portion of the hypermedia file is packaged for storage in the multimedia storage device, and the same non-restricted portion of the hypermedia file may be stored in the

Serial Number: 09/855,272Docket Number: 10010535-1

multimedia device. Applicant asserts that these elements are not shown or suggested in the cited combination of Mantha and Dubey.

Specifically, as set forth in the title, Mantha provides for a "method of saving a web page to a local hard drive to enable client-side browsing." In this regard, Mantha describes:

"A method of copying a web page presented for display on a browser of a web client. The web page comprises a base HTML document and a plurality of hypertext references, one or more of which may be associated with embedded objects (such as image files). The operation begins by copying a base HTML document to the client local storage and establishing a pointer to the copy of the document. A first linked list of the hypertext references in the base document is then generated. Thereafter, and for each hypertext reference in the first linked list, the following operations are performed. If the hypertext reference refers to an embedded object in the base HTML document, the embedded object is saved on the client local storage and the file name of the saved embedded object is stored "as a fully-qualified URL" in the second linked list. If the hypertext reference does not refer to an embedded object in the base HTML document, the fully-qualified URL of the hypertext reference is stored in the second linked list. Then, the fully-qualified URLs of the second linked list (including those associated with the stored images) are updated to point to the files located on the client's local storage. At the end of this operation, there is a new HTML page with links for images pointing to files on the local hard drive. When the user desires to retrieve the copied page, a link to the pointer is activated.

However, Mantha fails to show or suggest the concept of determining whether there is restricted content as a portion of the web page that may be prevented from being stored due to copyright restrictions or other concerns.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the cited combination of Mantha and Dubey fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claim 1 as amended. In addition, Applicant asserts that the cited combination of references fails to show or suggest the elements of claim 9, 17, and 22 to the extent that they have been amended, for example, to reflect a determination if any of the content of the hypermedia file is restricted from being stored in the multimedia storage device upon manipulation of the write actuator. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 9, 17, and 22 be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 4-6, 12-16, 19-21, and 25-27 have been amended herein so as to be consistent with the amendments to claims 1, 9, 17, and 22, respectively.

Serial Number:09/855,272


Docket Number: 10010535-1

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-21, and 23-27 be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 9, 17, and 22 as amended herein.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. D'Aurelio
Reg. No. 40,977

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC
5755 Granger Road, Suite 365
Independence, Ohio 44131
Phone: (216) 459-8302
Fax: (216) 459-8301